

NOTE ON THE GENUS *PANOPE*, MENARD.

By Dr. W. H. DALL.

Read 12th January, 1912.

ON the 17th of December, 1806, before the Faculty of the Museum of Natural History of Paris, France, M. Ménard de la Groye read a paper entitled "Mémoire sur un Nouveau Genre de Coquille bivalve-équivalve de la famille des Solenoides", etc., which was printed as a separate pamphlet in small quarto of thirty-seven pages, with one plate and a separate title-page, dated January, 1807. On the title-page it is indicated that the paper would appear in the issue of the *Annales* for February, 1807, as No. 19 of the collection; but in my copy, which is annotated by the author himself, this statement is corrected to read the issues for March and April, Nos. 50 and 51 of the collection of memoirs. In any case, the issue of the pamphlet antedates by at least a month the issue in the *Annales*. Turning to the latter, we see that not only is the memoir condensed from thirty-seven pages to nine, but the title is slightly shortened by leaving out the 'bivalve-équivalve', and it stops short after 'Solenoides'. Other important changes are made, as we shall see.

In the memoir of January, after thirty preliminary pages, the genus is formally described under the name *Panope*, which is stated on p. 16 to be the well-known name of a sea nymph in classical mythology. This name appears also on p. 30. No other Latin version of it occurs in the memoir; elsewhere the French equivalent alone is used, or the initial P. M. Ménard states expressly that Lamarek agreed with him as to the necessity for a new name for the genus, but does not state on what grounds.

The reason may well have been that twenty-one years before Lamarek applied the generic name of *Glycymeris* to this genus in his *Prodrome* of 1799, Da Costa had given it in binomial form to the *Arca glycymeris* of Linné.

In 1606 Ulysses Aldrovandus, in his work on animals without red blood, discussed the species to which the ancients had given the name of *Chama glycymeris* (p. 472), and figures a *Mya* (?), an *Anodonta*, and the recent *Panope* of the Mediterranean. He does not apply any special name to either of them. In the third book of Lister's *Historie Conchyliorum* (edition of 1687) he figures the same shell under the caption "Sect. 10. De Chamis" and refers to it (fig. 258) as "*Chama glycymeris Aldrovandi*", although it is only one of Aldrovandus' species. This citation has been accepted by nearly all subsequent authors. Gualtieri in 1742 referred it to his group of *Musculus* and described it in a phrase beginning "*Musculus rugis transversis*", etc. Finally, Born (Test. Mus. Cæs. Vind., 1780, p. 20) gives it the binomial name of *Mya glycymeris*, with a figure and references to the earlier authors, and is followed by Chemnitz in 1782 and Gmelin in 1792. It is to this shell that Ménard gives the name of *Panope Aldrovandi* in his January memoir.

Now, on referring to the abbreviated synopsis of the January memoir which appears in the *Annales du Muséum* (vol. ix, pp. 131-9, pl. xii) in the March and April numbers (probably issued in May), we find at the head of the formal description and on the following page in the synonymy that the name *Panope* has been changed to *Panopea*. This change is of course inadmissible under the rules of nomenclature, and the first published name for the genus must stand. The specific name given by Ménard to the Mediterranean recent species must give way to that applied to it by Born twenty-seven years previously, and the name of the type of the genus will therefore be *Panope glycymeris* (Born).

In 1812, in his *Extrait du Cours de Zoologie*, a synopsis of lectures delivered at the Museum, Lamarek uses the name *Panope* (p. 108), but in 1818, in the fifth volume of the *Animaux sans Vertèbres* (p. 456), he introduces the erroneous form *Panopæa* without comment. This form is indicated by Carus and Englemann (*Bibl. Zool.*, ii, p. 922, 1861) as used by Ménard in the *Nouveau Bulletin des Sciences, Société Philomatique* (Paris, 1809, t. i, No. 19, pp. 513-14), but on reference to the paper itself this is seen to be erroneous, as only the French form of the word is used in the review of Ménard's paper there printed. This laxity of citation appears in the work of nearly everyone who has referred to the nomenclature of the genus, and only a reference to the original will ensure to the student freedom from error.

The only other reference to the correct name I have been able to find is that of Herrmannsen, who, not having seen the original paper, cites it as *Panopæa* (*Index Gen. Mal.*, ii, p. 197, 1847) with doubt, and in his *Addenda et Corrigenda* of 1852 notes it as "*Panope sive Panopea*, Virgilio". To this authors seem to have paid no attention. Under various forms, *Panopea*, *Panopia*, etc., the name has remained in the works of those citing the genus. In 1889 the Marquis di Monterosato proposed (*Journ. de Conchyl.*, xxxvii, p. 26, note, 1889) to reserve the specific name *glycymeris*, Born, for the form found on the coasts of Spain, and to apply a new name, *cyclopana*, to the more elongated type found on the shores of Sicily and the Cyclopean Islands. The present writer has seen too few specimens of the European shell to have formed a positive opinion, but, if one may judge by analogy from the Floridan and Californian species of *Panope*, such modifications would fall well within the limits of specific variation.